A FULL DEFENCE

OF THE

Rev. JOHN WESLEY,

IN ANSWER TO THE SEVERAL

PERSONAL REFLECTIONS

CAST ON THAT GENTLEMAN

By the Rev. CALEB EVANS,

IN HIS

OBSERVATIONS

ON

Mr. WESLEY's LATE REPLY

PREFIXED TO

HIS CALM ADDRESS.

By THOMAS OLIVERS.

LONDON:
Printed in the Year 1776.

BRITISH MUSEUM

AA

A FULL DEFENCE OF THE Rev. JOHN WESLEY, &c.

SIR,

MY deſign is not to enter into the diſpute between you and Mr. Weſley concerning our American Colonies; but to make a few remarks on the obſervations prefixed to the new edition of your letter.

In the advertiſement, on the back of your title-page, you ſay, "The principal arguments of Mr. John Weſley, "in his Calm Addreſs to our American Colonies, are taken "*verbatim, without acknowledgment*, from Dr. Samuel John-"ſon's pamphlet." I anſwer, they are not *taken verbatim*; for there are, perhaps, above an hundred *verbal* alterations in the arguments taken from Johnſon's tract.—However, the arguments, you ſay, are "taken without acknowledge-"ment." That when they were firſt taken, they were not acknowledged to be Dr. Johnſon's, is true; but it is not true that they were never acknowledged; for in the ſecond edition of the Addreſs, publiſhed in London, Mr. Weſley ſays expreſly, "I extracted the chief arguments "from that treatiſe" [Taxation no Tyranny] "and added "an application to thoſe whom it moſt concerns."

Again, "The following extracts," you ſay, "from a "pamphlet, entitled, Free Thoughts on the preſent State "of public Affairs, publiſhed in 1770, by Mr. John Weſley, "may ſuffice to ſhew the inconſiſtency of that gentleman's "character. In page 1 of that Treatiſe, he ſays, I am no "politician; politics lie quite out of my province. And "in page 14, I do not defend the meaſures which have "been taken with regard to America: I doubt whether any "man can defend them, either on the foot of law, equity, "or prudence." To this I anſwer; when Mr. Weſley ſaid, "I am no politician," he plainly meant, I am not directly and properly one; and when he ſaid, "Politics lie quite out "of my province," he meant, they were no immediate part of his province as a divine. Had he meant, that as a divine he had nothing to do, more or leſs with politics, this would have been totally inconſiſtent even with the Free Thoughts on public Affairs he was at that time writing. And had he meant, "Politics lie ſo wide of my pro-"vince," that it does not at all belong to me to ſpeak or write any thing concerning them, he would not only have condemned you, and multitudes of our beſt divines, but alſo Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

Chriſt, you know Sir, often reaſoned on political ſubjects, both with his enemies and his friends: you know, he taught the people to render to Cæſar the things which were Cæſar's, and unto God the things which were God's.

The Apoſtles alſo (to whoſe province politics did not IMMEDIATELY belong) often ſpake and wrote on political ſubjects. "Let EVERY SOUL, ſaid St. Paul, be ſubject to the higher powers, for there is NO POWER but of God; the powers that BE are ordained of God. Whoſoever, therefore, reſiſteth the power, reſiſteth the ordinance of God; and they that reſiſt, ſhall receive to themſelves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power, do that which is good, and thou ſhalt have praiſe of the ſame; for he is the miniſter of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the ſword in vain: for he is the miniſter

miniſter of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye muſt needs be ſubject, not only for wrath, but alſo for conſcience ſake. For, for this cauſe pay you tribute alſo: for they are God's miniſters, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due, cuſtom to whom cuſtom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour."

Nor did St. Paul think it enough to be thus far a politician himſelf, but inſtructed and commanded Titus to become one alſo. "Put them in mind (ſays the great Apoſtle to this Chriſtian biſhop) to be ſubject to principalities and powers, to obey magiſtrates, to be ready to every good work."

St. Peter alſo was thus far a politician. "Submit yourſelves, ſaid he, to every ordinance of men for the Lord's ſake. Whether it be to the King as ſupreme, or unto Governors, as unto them who are ſent by him for the puniſhment of evil-doers, and for the praiſe of them that do well. For ſo is the will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to ſilence the ignorance of fooliſh men: as free, and not uſing your liberty for a cloke of maliciouſneſs, but as the ſervants of God. Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the King."—In his ſecond epiſtle likewiſe he obſerves, "The Lord knoweth how to reſerve the wicked unto the day of judgment to be puniſhed: but CHIEFLY them that walk after the fleſh in the luſt of uncleanneſs, and deſpiſe government: preſumptuous are they, ſays the Apoſtle, ſelf-willed, and ARE NOT AFRAID TO SPEAK EVIL OF DIGNITIES." To the ſame effect is the proteſt which St. Jude enters againſt thoſe filthy dreamers who "defile the fleſh, AND DESPISE DOMINION, AND SPEAK EVIL OF DIGNITIES."

I have been the more particular in quoting theſe ſacred paſſages, becauſe, firſt, they ſet forth the duty, the indiſpenſible duty, which all owe to kings, and to thoſe in authority under them: and becauſe, ſecondly, they demonſtrate the propriety of Mr. Weſley's conduct, who, though he does

not think it any part of his province to enter minutely into the ſtudy of politics, yet thinks it his duty, as a divine, to explain and enforce the importance of obedience to magiſtrates.

But you aſk, "how came Mr. John Weſley, who was then "no politician, to commence one now?" I anſwer; in the ſenſe that he was no politician then, he remains no politician ſtill: and in the ſenſe that he was a politician when he wrote his Calm Addreſs; he was a politician when he wrote his Free Thoughts on Public Affairs.—You go on: "How "comes he now to appear a defender of ſuch meaſures, as "before he admitted to be indefenſible?" Becauſe, ſince 1770, things in Great Britain and her colonies, wear a quite different aſpect; and, becauſe Mr. Weſley ſince that period, has had many means of farther information, particularly Dr. Johnſon's Tract; by which he was convinced of his former miſtake.

Again, Mr. Weſley, you ſay, was "publicly accuſed of "the groſſeſt inconſiſtency in publiſhing Sentiments upon "American Affairs, diametrically oppoſite to thoſe he had be-"fore openly avowed." I anſwer; Mr. Weſley has of late been publicly accuſed, by a number of hot-headed Antinomians, of ſeveral very unaccountable things, which the public would never have heard of, if he had not differed in religious ſentiments from theſe his meek-hearted antagoniſts! But no candid man will accuſe him of the GROSSEST inconſiſtency, for altering his ſentiments on ſuch a ſubject, in the ſpace of five years, neither blame him for avowing that alteration. If all among the wiſeſt and beſt of men, who thus change their ſentiments, were to be accuſed of the groſſeſt inconſiſtency, how few would eſcape the accuſation!

Again, you accuſe him "of the moſt flagrant want of can-"dour, to ſay the leaſt, in not telling the world when he firſt "publiſhed his Addreſs, that he was once of a different ſenti-"ment, and giving them the reaſons of the ſurpriſing change." How aſtoniſhing is this! Mr. Weſley is publicly accuſed of the moſt flagrant want of candour, for not telling the world, when

when he firſt publiſhed his Addreſs, THAT which has no connexion with, or influence on, the matter in hand! Does not every one ſee, that if he had told the public, "I was once "of another mind," this would have had no influence on the argument, either one way or the other?

He is next accuſed of want of "honeſty, in publiſhing as "his own, what he had pilfered from another." To this I anſwer, Firſt. If he has acted only from a concern for the diſorder of his country, and from a deſire of contributing a little towards the healing of theſe diſorders, I can ſee a great deal of HUMANITY, but not the ſmalleſt degree of diſhoneſty in his conduct.

Secondly. Have not you, yourſelf, Sir, and almoſt every one who has wrote againſt the Calm Addreſs, fallen into the very thing you condemn in Mr. Weſley? I have caſt my eye over moſt of the anſwers publiſhed on this occaſion; and, if I am not greatly miſtaken, moſt of you have borrowed (I do not ſay, "pilfered,") one from the other, without telling the public a ſyllable about it: and yet all this time none of you have done any thing amiſs!

Thirdly. The Calm Addreſs, as ſuch, is not Dr. Johnſon's, but Mr. Weſley's. It is true, moſt of its bones (ſo to ſpeak) were taken from Dr. Johnſon's tract. But then theſe bones were put each into its own place, covered with fleſh and ſkin, and then the whole ſet in motion by Mr. Weſley. In other words; moſt of the arguments in this addreſs are borrowed from Dr. Johnſon. But, certainly, the introduction is Mr. Weſley's: it was he alſo who ſelected the arguments; who diſpoſed them; who abridged them; who altered abundance of their phraſeology; and who added to the whole, a large and pointed application to thoſe whom it may concern. On all theſe accounts, therefore, the Calm Addreſs may with great honeſty and propriety be called Mr. Weſley's.

Again, you ſay, "I have heard it" (your letter) "found "fault with as being much too mild, conſidering the dupli-

"city

"city of the perſon to whom it was addreſſed." I really think, Sir, that conſidering, firſt, what you are as related to the ſtate, and, ſecondly, what as compared to Mr. Weſley, it would have been much more becoming you on this occaſion, to have been quiet and to have minded your own buſineſs.

And, firſt, what are you as related to the ſtate? I anſwer, a diſſenter from its eſtabliſhment—who is not only connived at—but even tolerated! And are you the perſon who employs his heart, his head, his pen againſt ſuch a government? Are you, in the ſame moment that you are ſheltered and nouriſhed under its wing, an advocate for thoſe who are tearing out its vitals? who are meditating, and, by all poſſible means, ſeeking its deſtruction? What! cannot an old ſervant of God, who thinks he lives under the beſt government in the world, lift up an aged voice or a withered hand in its behalf, but YOU muſt take the alarm? but YOU muſt kindle into a flame? And is this the return YOU make for all the tenderneſs, for all the indulgence, for all the protection, which you and your forefathers have received from the governors of this land?

But, ſecondly, let us ſee what you are as compared to Mr. Weſley. And, firſt, he is an old man, and you are a young one. Secondly, he has had better natural endowments,—and better opportunities of improving them. Thirdly, he has laboured in his maſter's vineyard a thouſand times more than you have done. And, fourthly, he has been almoſt infinitely more uſeful in his day and generation than you either have been or are likely to be. For you, therefore, to talk of being too mild, conſidering the duplicity of the perſon whom you have addreſſed, how extremely does it become your years, your experience, yea, your whole character!

"He next," you ſay, "exhibits to his readers the flowers "ſtrewed in my tract, ſuch as Contemptible ſophiſtry! "Childiſh quirks! Pitiful ſophiſms!" That theſe flowers are ſtrewed up and down your tract is infallibly certain: the firſt of which adorns your ſeventh page, and moſt of the reſt

the

the page which follows. "But," you ſay, "he has very "prudently declined refering his readers to the pages theſe "flowers adorn, becauſe they would then inſtantly ſee that "they are flowers of Mr. Weſley's own cultivation." Flowers of Mr. Weſley's own cultivation! How ſo? I thought that the arguments you are pleaſed to call "Contemptible ſo-"phiſtry," &c. were not his own; but "pilfered from an-"other:" that they were "taken verbatim from Dr. John-"ſon." The caſe is plainly this; when you would impeach Mr. Weſley's HONESTY, the arguments are not his own, but Dr. Johnſon's; hence he is "convicted of the moſt pal-"pable forgery" in offering them to the world. But when you would expoſe his incapacity, the arguments are no longer Dr. Johnſon's: no; then they are "flowers of his own cul-"tivation," and are preſented to him as his UNDOUBTED RIGHT. Nor is this all; for ſuch is your dexterity, that you can not only transfer theſe arguments from Dr. Johnſon to Mr. Weſley, and then from Mr. Weſley to Dr. Johnſon again; but, when occaſion requires, you can ſo alter their very nature as to change them from "Arguments" into "Childiſh quirks," and from "Childiſh quirks," into "Arguments" again!

Farther, "Mr. Weſley," you ſay, "is ſurely the laſt man "in the world that ſhould find fault with mere aſſertions, be-"cauſe he has all his life-time made uſe of them inſtead of "arguments" Whoever has looked into Mr. Weſley's Appeals, his anſwers to Dr. Middleton, Dr. Taylor, &c. his Predeſtination calmly conſidered, and fifty other pieces, muſt know that this is a palpable untruth.

"As to the florid quotations," you ſay, "I certainly "might have ſaved myſelf the trouble of telling the readers "they were quotations. Mr. Weſley has a ſhorter way: "Like him, I might have made them my own words, and "kept my own counſel; and who knows but they might "have paſſed undetected." I anſwer: if, when you have borrowed ſentiments, phraſes, and even arguments from others, you have always told that they were borrowed, and alſo from whom, it is well: but ſuppoſe you have not, where

is

is the harm? In the caſe now under conſideration, there is none done to Dr. Johnſon. A gentlewoman who is intimate with the Doctor told me, that ſhe aſked him what he thought of Mr. Weſley's Addreſs? who anſwered, that he much approved of it, or words to that effect. And as to the public, Mr. Weſley has done them a ſingular favour, in letting them have the ſubſtance of an eighteen-penny book, of ſuch intrinſic value, with additions and improvements, and all at the price of two-pence.

Again, "to be ſure," you ſay, "if Mr. Weſley had recommended Johnſon's book, which had imparted ſuch light "to him, or candidly informed his readers, upon his firſt publiſhing his Addreſs, that it was chiefly extracted from "Johnſon's Treatiſe, this would not have anſwered the end "of imparting light to others." I anſwer: matter of fact ſhews that it would not have done ſo well. Dr. Johnſon's book had been often recommended before Mr. Weſley ſaw it; yet it had not the run, no not the hundredth part of it, that the Calm Addreſs had, in the ſhort ſpace of a few weeks.

You go on. "The facts relative to Mr. Weſley himſelf, I "had long been poſſeſſed of; and ſhould not have wrote at "all, as I verily believe, had it not been to expoſe the ſhameful verſatility and diſingenuity of this artful man, and to "prevent, as far as I could, the ſpread of that miſchief, "his performance might otherwiſe be productive of." The facts relative to Mr. Weſley himſelf—Pray, what facts do you mean? If you intend thoſe which relate to Dr. Johnſon's Tract and Mr. Weſley's Addreſs, you could not long be poſſeſſed of theſe, unleſs you poſſeſſed them before they exiſted. For the Addreſs was not thought on, much leſs was it wrote or publiſhed, till a few weeks before your letter appeared; but if you intend any other facts, they are nothing to the purpoſe. But you ſay, you ſhould not have wrote, "Had it "not been to expoſe the ſhameful verſatility and diſingenuity, "of this artful man." And do you call it ſhameful verſatility and diſingenuity to have read a tract, which oppoſed the principles he then believed? and to be ſo open to conviction as thereby to be convinced of his miſtake? and then, without delay, to let the world know his ſentiments were changed.

changed. Candid reader, is not this a wonderful proof of "the ſhameful verſatility and diſingenuity of this artful "man"? But whoſe language is this? It can hardly be Mr. Evans's! He cannot be ſo inſolent! I ſee a greater man behind the curtain. Come out then and ſhew yourſelf if you dare.

But, to return. The true reaſon of your writing this letter comes out at laſt. You ſay, it was "to prevent the miſchief "his performance might otherwiſe be productive of." To prevent the miſchief!—What miſchief do you mean? Why, the miſchief of being ſubject to principalities and powers.—The plain caſe is this: the Americans, who at the beginning of their colonization conſiſted of a very ſmall handful of people; Great Britain, in a ſhort ſpace of time, raiſed up to a mighty empire.—This ſhe did at a very large expence both of blood and of money.—By this means ſhe vaſtly encreaſed her load of public debt.—At laſt ſhe required the Colonies to bear a very ſmall part of the enormous burden.—This demand ſhe did not make till they had acquired ſuch power and riches, that they thought themſelves able to withſtand all the power of the parent ſtate.—Notwithſtanding this, when the Mother Country made that reaſonable, that equitable, that eaſy demand, they broke out, firſt, into tumults, and then into open rebellion.—As it was not conſiſtent with the dignity of a nation, which had ſo often chaſtiſed the greateſt powers of Europe, to be bullied by her own children out of ſo juſt a requiſition, ſhe grew firm in her determinations, and prepared a ſmall force to over-awe, and, if neceſſary, to chaſtiſe their ingratitude. On the information of this, large armies of rebels took the field — and this occaſioned the Mother Country to prepare a larger force to withſtand them; of conſequence, nothing was now expected, but that, in a ſhort time, there would be a moſt dreadful effuſion of kindred blood.

Now this was the ſituation of affairs between Great Britain and her colonies, when Mr. Weſley wrote his Calm Addreſs; the deſign of which evidently was, to convince the Americans of the great impropriety of their preſent conduct; to call them back from an unnatural rebellion, to the duties

of

of good ſubjects; and, by theſe means, to prevent the effuſion of blood, and the calamities of a civil war.—When this ſeaſonable, this calm, this humane Addreſs made its appearance, it was read and approved of by thouſands and myriads; and ſo great was the demand for it, that I believe the like has not been known in England, at leaſt for theſe hundred years.

But in a ſhort time, the Reverend Mr. Evans wrote aginſt it. And what was his deſign in this? He tells us in plain terms: "to prevent, as far as I could, the ſpread of "that miſchief his performance might otherwiſe produce." It is then evident, the miſchief this gentleman would prevent, is, the miſchief of ſilencing the voice of tumult! the miſchief of weakening the hands of riot! the miſchief of quelling the ſpirit of faction! the miſchief of preventing all the horrors of a civil war: that is, the miſchief of preventing towns and cities from being turned into heaps of aſhes! fruitful fields from becoming barren deſarts and fields of blood! the miſchief of preventing the joyful wife from becoming an inconſoleable widow, and the hopeful ſon from becoming an helpleſs orphan! above all, the miſchief of preventing myriads of immortal ſpirits from launching, unprepared, into an awful Eternity! Theſe, good Sir, theſe are a few of the miſchiefs which you, through the tenderneſs of your compaſſion, have laboured to prevent!

In the next place, you ſay; "He pretends to give a ſpeci-"men of my arguments: with what fairneſs and integrity he "does it, I appeal to the public at whoſe tribunal I ſtand. "This writer (Americanus) aſſerts, ſays, Mr. Weſley, twen-"ty times over, he that is taxed without his own conſent, "that is, without being repreſented, is a ſlave. Mr. Weſley "anſwers, no, I have no repreſentative in parliament, but "I am taxed; yet I am no ſlave. Yea, nine in ten through "the kingdom of England, &c." I anſwer, when you ſay, "He pretends to give a ſpecimen of my arguments," you mean, your reaſonings or arguments, properly ſo called. Therefore you ſay in the next ſentence, "Such, candid reader, is "the ſpecimen Mr. Weſley exhibits of my ARGUMENTS, "and of his own deciſive anſwer to them." And on ſuppoſition that they are your arguments which he has miſrepreſent-

ed your appeal to the public againſt his unfairneſs and want of integrity. Yet, (who would believe it!) there is not a word in the place you have quoted concerning your arguments. What is ſaid, is concerning your ASSERTIONS, not your arguments, good or bad. Mr. Weſley's words are, "This writer ASSERTS, &c." Is this, Sir, giving a ſpecimen of your your arguments? And yet *you* can very gravely exclaim againſt unfairneſs and want of integrity!

But though you thus miſrepreſent Mr. Weſley, he ſpeaks with truth and accuracy, in calling your words mere aſſertions. For you ſay, "If you are taxed without your own "conſent, you are ſlaves:" and all that you have to ſupport that aſſertion with, is, "If every man that is taxed without "his own conſent, is not a ſlave, wherein is the difference "betwixt ſlavery and liberty?" You therefore are certainly right, that "according to" *this* (not "*his* ſpecimen of "them" [the arguments] "they ſubſiſt only in *vacuo*."

"My florid quotations," you ſay, "are treated juſt as "cavalierly as my own nutſhell arguments." "The cele"brated Monteſquieu, is the fanciful Monteſquieu, Mr. "Weſley tells us; and becauſe he aſſerts that all the inha"bitants of England have a right of voting at the election "of a repreſentative, except ſuch as are ſo mean as to be "deemed *to have no will of their own*, he very cunningly in"fers, that certainly this right belongs then to every man, "woman, and child in England! This, doubtleſs is to "prove how ſcandalous it is to charge Mr. Weſley with mak"ing uſe of childiſh quirks." Pray, Sir, in what part of this reaſoning lies the childiſh quirk? Monteſquieu ſays, "Every "one who has a will of his own, has a right to vote for a "member of parliament." Mr. Weſley anſwers, but every man, woman and child, has a will of his own. Therefore, according to Monteſquieu, every man, woman and child in England has a right of voting. Now, as here is a regular argument, conſiſting of major, minor and concluſion, let us ſee, if there be any childiſh quirk, in which of them it lies. You will not ſay, it is in the firſt propoſition; for that is Monteſquieu's and your own. The ſecond, that every

man, woman, and child in England has a will of his own, is Mr. Weſley's; and, perhaps, for this very reaſon, the childiſh quirk lies here! But does it indeed? Is it not true, that every man, woman and child has a will of his own? You intimate, with a ſneer, that married ladies have not. But I aſk, have not thouſands of married ladies a PROPERTY of their own? And what reaſon is there why they muſt not have a will (even a civil, a legal will) of their own, to diſpoſe of it? Does not the conſtitution of England allow them this privilege? and if it does, can it ſuppoſe them to have no will to do it? And what is ſaid of married ladies, will equally hold good in the caſe of "old maids" and others. Therefore, here is no childiſh quirk; but a ſolid truth, built on undeniable matter of fact. If then there is any childiſh quirk, it muſt be in the concluſion. But this cannot be, ſeeing it naturally and regularly flows out of the premiſes. I am therefore inclined to believe, that the true reaſon why you called this a childiſh quirk is, becauſe it was eaſier to call names, that to anſwer the argument.

"The anſwer to judge Blackſtone," you ſay, "is of the "ſame complection with that to the fanciful Monteſquieu." You mean, to be ſure, it is an other childiſh quirk. But let us ſee it with our own eyes. "Judge Blackſtone," ſays, in the quotation I have made from that great man, in a free ſtate, every man who is ſuppoſed to be a free agent, ought to be, in ſome meaſure his own governor. But ſays Mr. Weſley, this argument proves too much. For are not women free agents: yea, and poor as well as rich men? According to "this argument there is no free ſtate under the ſun." Now to diſcover the childiſhneſs of this quirk, let the reader take notice, firſt, of Mr. Weſley's propoſition, "This argu- "ment proves too much." Next take notice of the argument which ſupports it. "For are not women free agents? "Yea, and poor as well as rich men?" Now, as to the matter of this argument, it conſiſts of undeniable matter of fact. And as to the manner of it, though it be expreſſed by way of interrogative, every one knows that this is equivalent to a poſitive affirmation. So far then there is no childiſh quirk.

If

If then there is any, it muſt be in the conſequence. Well, let us ſee it. "According to this argument there is no free "ſtate under the ſun." And is not this true? and does not this truth naturally follow? For is there a ſtate under the ſun wherein every man and woman, the poor as well as the rich, is his own political governor? If there is, point it out, or you cannot ſhew that this is a childiſh quirk.

But be it a childiſh quirk or a good argument, let us ſee how you anſwer it. You had ſaid, "In a free ſtate "every man who is ſuppoſed to be a free agent ought to be "in ſome meaſure his own governor." Mr. Weſley, anſwered, that "this proves to much. For are not women free "agents? Yea, and poor as well as rich men? According "to this argument there is no free ſtate under the ſun." To this you reply, "Well argued, indeed! The ſiſters of all "this gentleman's ſocieties," (and why not the ſiſters of Mr. Evans' ſociety?) "will, it is hoped, wait upon him in a "body, with Mrs. Weſley at their head, to thank him for "thus ably ſupporting the juſt rights and franchiſes of fe-"male nature!" Now, reader, judge who has moſt reaſon to complain of childiſh quirks, &c. Mr. Weſley, who anſwers cloſely and logically? or Mr. Evans, who replies with an impertinent ſneer?

But now comes the great evil of all. "The following "paragragh," you ſay, "is the only remaining one that "deſerves an anſwer, and it ſhall have an effectual and ſe-"rious one. The book, ſays, Mr. Weſley, which this wri-"ter (Americanus) ſays, I ſtrongly recommended I never "yet ſaw with my eyes. I reply, the book refered to (ſee "page 22, of my letter to Mr. Weſley) is intitled, An Argu-"ment in defence of the excluſive right claimed by the Co-"lonies to tax themſelves. Now I ſolemnly declare that this "very book was put into my hands by a particular friend "of mine, as a book Mr. J. Weſley had ſtrongly recom-"mended to Mr. Pine, one of his own people, upon the ſub-"ject of American taxation. Mr. Pine, (printer in Wine-"ſtreet, Briſtol) declares, and will make oath if required, "that the Rev. John Weſley, with his own hands put this

" book into his (Mr. Pine's) hands, accompanying it with " the ſtrongeſt recommendations, and requeſting him to pub- " liſh extracts from it in his Gazette,"—" that in conſe- " quence hereof, he"—" read this book himſelf, recom- " mended it"—" to many of his friends, and publiſhed ex- " tracts from it, as deſired by Mr. Weſley,"—" and the " identical book which he received from Mr. John Weſley's " own hands, Mr. Pine has now in his poſſeſſion."—" The " Rev. Mr. Rouquet,"—" declares, and will make oath " if required, that the Rev. John Weſley recommended the " aforeſaid book to him, in conſequence of which he pur- " chaſed and read it, &c." The ſubſtance of this whole paragraph is, Though Mr. Weſley has declared that he never ſaw the book in queſtion, yet it appears from the teſti- monies of Mr. Rouquet and Mr. Pine, that he had both ſeen and recommended it; and, of conſequence he muſt be a notorious liar.

That Mr. Weſley has aſſerted he never ſaw this book, is granted. It is alſo granted, that he had both ſeen and recom- mended it. But does it hence follow, that he is a liar? It does not. To make this fully appear, let it be obſerved, that a lie is a declaration of any thing to be true or falſe, which he who declares it knows, AT THE TIME OF DECLARING IT, to be otherwiſe. If the thing aſſerted, be falſe in itſelf, if the aſſerter believes, AT THE SAME TIME HE ASSERTS IT, that it is true, this is not a lie, but a miſtake.—Now, ac- cording to this account, if you would prove Mr. Weſley to be a liar, you muſt not only prove that he ſaw the book which he declares he never ſaw; but, alſo, that he knew, AT THE TIME HE DECLARED THIS, that he had ſeen it. But this you cannot do: of conſequence you cannot prove that he is a liar.

That he is not, I prove from the abſolute improbability and abſurdity of the ſuppoſition, that a perſon of Mr. Weſley's CHARACTER ſhould, on SUCH AN OCCASION, be guilty of SUCH A LIE!

And,

And, firſt, a perſon of Mr. Weſley's CHARACTER, &c. where is the man who has given greater, if ſo great proof, that he is a teacher come from God? Where is the man who makes more full, if as full proof of his miniſtry? What he has done for God, and what God has done by him, conſtrains us to view his character in a very exalted light. And, firſt, what he has done for God; both late and early, by night and by day; and that not only by fits and ſtarts, but uniformly, for fifty years together, exceeds all that has been done by any five or ten men living, which we have any account of.

Add to this, ſecondly, what God has done by him. How many thouſands has he been inſtrumental in turning from the evil of their way? If you would ſee them, go to the eaſt and to the weſt, to the north and to the ſouth: go to almoſt every city, town and village, to almoſt every mountain, valley and common in the three kingdoms. Now, that ſuch a diſtinguiſhed ſervant of God, between ſeventy and eighty years of age, ſhould, after ſuch a ſeries of labours and ſucceſſes, turn prevaricator and liar, requires an uncommon degree of uncharitableneſs to believe.

But this will appear yet more unlikely, when we conſider, ſecondly, ON WHAT OCCASION he is ſuppoſed to lie. Had he been threatened with the rack, the gibbet, or the flames, this might have been ſome temptation. Or had he been in danger of impriſonment, baniſhment, or the loſs of all his ſubſtance, this might have been ſome temptation to him. But when we obſerve, that this was not the caſe; and that the only difficulty he lay under was, that a young man, of no note, in a poor two-penny pamphlet, about politics, had told him, that he formerly recommended a tract, which contradicts his preſent ſentiments on that ſubject, how aſtoniſhingly abſurd is it to ſuppoſe, that SUCH A CHARGE ſhould turn SUCH A MAN into a wilful liar!—And this abſurdity will appear ſtill greater, when we obſerve, that he might have extricated himſelf out of this inſignificant difficulty, only by ſaying, I once thought the Americans were right; but I am now of another mind! Add thirdly, to all that has been

 ſaid,

ſaid, the folly of telling SUCH A LIE. If a perſon, but of an ordinary capacity, takes it into his head to turn liar, or prevaricator, he takes care ſo to contrive matters, that he may not eaſily be detected. But Mr. Weſley is ſuppoſed to lie ſo unguardedly and fooliſhly, as if he did it only for the ſake of being detected and expoſed: that is, he is ſuppoſed to recommend a book to Mr. Rouquet and Mr. Pine, and alſo in public company, and then, while he remembered all this, to declare that he never ſaw it!

In like manner, he is ſuppoſed to utter certain words in various companies, and, in particular, when addreſſing the members of his ſociety, conſiſting of many hundred perſons; and then, while he remembered this, to deny, in the moſt public manner, that ſuch words ever came out of his mouth. Could I believe this of Mr. Weſley, I would ſay, not only that he is the moſt WICKED, but alſo, the moſt FOOLISH liar that ever lied. For did he not know, that a falſhood told in ſuch a manner, could not fail of being detected and expoſed in a few days? To ſuppoſe, therefore, that ſuch a perſon, on ſuch an occaſion, would publiſh ſuch a wilful falſehood, while ſuch conſequences ſtared him in the face, is a moſt abſurd and ridiculous ſuppoſition.

But if Mr. Weſley ſaw this book, and yet declared that he did not ſee it, how is this to be accounted for, ſo as to exculpate him from the charge of lying? I anſwer, by ſuppoſing that his memory failed. And this ſuppoſition is ſupported by the greateſt degree of probability. Mr Weſley is now an old man, between ſeventy and eighty years of age. Add to this, that at this very time he has ſuch a variety and multiplicity of buſineſs, as few men could manage, even in the prime of life. For inſtance, there are few weeks in which he does not travel two or three hundred miles; preach and exhort in public between twenty and thirty times, and often more; anſwer thirty or forty letters; ſpeak with as many perſons in private, concerning things of deep importance; prepare, either in whole or in part ſomething for the preſs. Add to all this, that often in that ſhort ſpace of time, a variety of tracts on different ſubjects, paſs through his hands, particularly as he travels:

and that if any tract does not immediately relate to his office as a divine, though he may give it a curſory reading, yet he does not think it neceſſary to charge his memory with its contents; I ſay, when all theſe things are conſidered, no one will think it ſtrange that his memory ſhould often fail.

And that this is true in fact, is well known to thoſe who are about Mr. Weſley. Many inſtances of this could eaſily be produced; but let a ſingle one ſuffice. Mr. J. B. who travels with Mr. Weſley, told me a few days ago, that Mr. Weſley lately ſupped in company with a diſſenting miniſter: that this gentleman aſked Mr. Weſley, if he had not ſpoke ſuch words to another diſſenting miniſter, when he dined, ſome time before in company with him? Mr. Weſley anſwered, that, to the beſt of his knowledge, he had never dined with or ſeen that miniſter. Yet the next morning, when the former gentleman returned, Mr. Weſley ſaid, "I am glad you are come; for I have recollected that I did dine with Mr. E. and very probably the words you mentioned did paſs between us.

I therefore conclude, from all that has been ſaid, that when Mr. Weſley ſaid in his Calm Addreſs, "he never ſaw "the book," it was not owing to any want of varacity; but merely through the defect of his memory.—And this is the account of the matter which Mr. Weſley himſelf gave, November 12, in a letter to the Rev. James Rouquet. "Dear "James," ſays, Mr. Weſley, "I will now ſimply tell you "the thing as it is. As I was returning from the Leeds "Conference, one gave me the tract, which you refer to, "part of which I read on my journey. The ſpirit of it I "obſerved to be admirably good: and I *then* thought the "arguments concluſive. In conſequence of which, I ſup-"poſe (though I do not remember it) I recommended it "both to you and others: but I had ſo entirely forgotten it, "that even when it was brought to me the other day, I "could not recollect, that I had ſeen it."—You ſee, Sir, how this account agrees with that which I have given: not, indeed, from any thing I knew of what Mr. Weſley would ſay for himſelf, (for he was out of town when moſt of this letter

letter was drawn up) but from the nature and probability of the thing.

I have only one circumſtance more to take notice of. You ſay in the concluſion of your Obſervations, "How far theſe "things may ſerve to give Mr. Weſley more light, I cannot "ſay: but if they do not give the public more light into his "real character, I can only ſay, *Si populus vult decipi, deci-* "*piatur.* If the people *will* be deceived, let them be de- "ceived." So the public, I find, are to look upon Mr. Weſley as a wilful liar, and abominable deceiver, becauſe through forgetfulneſs he ſaid, he never ſaw a pamphlet which he had ſeen! And is it poſſible, Sir, that you who have been ſo long almoſt his next-door neighbour, can find nothing in his whole conduct ſo characteriſtic of him as theſe paultry circumſtances? You certainly are no ſtranger to what he has been doing and ſuffering on account of religion theſe laſt fifty years. You have been an eye or an ear-witneſs of what he has done and ſuffered in Briſtol, Kingſwood, Coleford, Wedneſbury, Cornwall, Newcaſtle, Yorkſhire, London, and almoſt every other part of the kingdom. You have been an eye or an ear-witneſs of the many thouſands whom he has been inſtrumental in turning from Satan to God. And is all this to be looked upon as no proof of his being a good man? While the trifles you have mentioned are to paſs for demonſtrations that he is a mere knave? O, Sir, if the candid public will not look upon this as an evidence of ſomething materially wrong in you, I am ſadly out in my prognoſtics.

It is true, in your letter to Mr. Weſley, you SAY, "I "love and honour *all good men*, all men of real principle "and INTEGRITY, however they may differ from me in "political or religious ſentiments." But, I am ſadly miſtaken if this very declaration does not demonſtrate the contrary: ſuppoſe by love you mean what St. Paul does in the thirteenth chapter of his firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians. His account is, that ἀγαπη, love or charity, *thinketh no evil*; but *believeth all things, and hopeth all things.* It thinketh no

evil

evil of any one without the moſt abſolute neceſſity, nor even then without the cleareſt proof. But you, Sir, without either of theſe, think evil, extremely evil of Mr. Weſley. For in your profeſſion of love before-mentioned, you mark theſe words, "*good men*," in Italics, and the word, "INTEGRITY," in capitals; plainly intimating, that you do not think Mr. Weſley is *a good man*, or a man of principle and INTEGRITY.—Again; it believeth and hopeth all things, that are good of every one; and that not only if there be but the ſmalleſt degree of evidence in the perſon's favour, but if there is not the fulleſt evidence to the contrary. And where it is forced to believe there is a fault, it readily believes any circumſtance which has any tendency to extenuate it. It alſo hopeth all things. Where it is conſtrained to believe there is an evil, it hopes it was the firſt, and will be the laſt; that there was ſome remarkable temptation to it, or that it has been deeply repented of: and thus a loving heart thinks, believes, and hopes the beſt of every one.

If you would ſee this charity exemplified in a living character, ſee it in the behaviour of Mr. Weſley towards yourſelf. When he (through miſtake) thought you had aſſerted what was not true, he drew a veil of true, unaffected charity, over it; ſaying, "I REALLY BELIEVE he was told ſo."—Now this charity, as ſtated by the Apoſtle, and as exemplified in the Chriſtian behaviour of Mr. Weſley, I am confident you do not poſſeſs. For had this been the caſe, you would not have THOUGHT, you would not have BELIEVED, much leſs would you have publicly SAID, that Mr. Weſley was an artful, deſigning, diſhoneſt man: you would not have ſtrained an inconſiderable circumſtance or two, to make the world believe, that with ſilver locks about his ears, and with one foot in the grave, he is commenced a wilful liar: you would not have PRODUCED the declarations, and OFFERED the depoſitions of ſeveral witneſſes to drive your improbable and ridiculous charge into the very heart of his reputation: you would not have given him yonr *decent* advice to become an honeſt man before he drops into the grave! In ſhort, had you really poſſeſſed the charity you make

make ſuch pompous profeſſions of, inſtead of teaching you to brand Mr. Weſley with the mark of public infamy, it would have taught you to excuſe a miſtake, to extenuate a fault, yea, to cover a multitude of them: it would have taught you to ſay, Though Mr. Weſley declares he never ſaw the book, which it is certain he has ſeen, I do not on that account impeach his veracity or doubt the goodneſs of his heart. But I verily believe, that partly through the hurry of buſineſs, and partly through the infirmities of age, his memory has failed.

This, moſt certainly, is the ſpirit and language of true, divine, goſpel charity. And therefore I leave it to the world to judge, whether the charity which you have diſplayed on this occaſion is any other than that of a cenſorious bigot, or a furious patriot.

POSTCRIPT.

I have juſt ſeen, in the Gazetteer, your laſt letter to Mr. Weſley, and have ſtopped the preſs while I make a few obſervations on it.

You ſay, "As you have at length favoured me with your *public acknowledgment*, our controverſy is at an end." I anſwer: the controverſy between Mr. Weſley and you was, concerning the right of parliament to tax the Colonies; and the acknowledgment Mr. Weſley made was, that he was miſtaken in ſaying he never ſaw the book you mentioned. Now, Sir, how does *this acknowledgment* put an end to *this controverſy?* Why, truly, juſt as an American, by ſhooting a hole through the ſkirt of an Engliſh Corporal, would end the controverſy between England and America. But, good Sir, have you not here intended an impoſition on your readers, by making them believe that Mr. Weſley has made more acknowledgment than he really has?—You add, "To triumph over the vanquiſhed would be ungenerous." Pray, in what reſpect have you vanquiſhed Mr. Weſley? Why, in this; in a controverſy between you concerning the power of Great Britain

to

to tax the Colonies; Mr. Weſley, through miſtake, denied having ſeen a certain tract; but on recollecting that he had ſeen it, acknowledged his miſtake. Now this acknowledgment, which has nothing to do with the merits of the cauſe, vanquiſhes Mr. Weſley, ends the controverſy, and would leave you triumphant, only you are too generous to triumph!

" It is, however, neceſſary," you ſay, " for me to ob-" ſerve, that your inſinuating, that I have taken as much " from Mr. P."—" as you have from Dr. Johnſon."—" is " not *fact*; and if it were, IT IS NOTHING TO THE PURPOSE." This, Sir, is certainly true. If *your* Arguments prove the points they are brought to prove, it can be nothing to the purpoſe from whence they are taken. And does it not follow, by parity of reaſon, that if Mr. Weſley's arguments prove the points *they* are brought to prove, it is nothing to the purpoſe from whence *they* are taken? If you allow this, ſee the impropriety of your clamour about " pil-" fering" arguments from others: if you do not allow it, ſee your want of *candour* and *impartiality*, in refuſing to another ſuch liberty as you take yourſelf.

" But you intimate," you ſay, " my perſonal charges " againſt you are foreign. I am of a different opinion." Are you ſo? then certainly your opinion is wrong: for what connexion is there between Mr. Weſley's perſonal character, and the diſpute ſubſiſting between Great Britain and America? Could you prove Mr. Weſley to be a fool and a knave, would it thence follow that the Coloniſts are wiſe and virtuous in oppoſing government? Or could it be proved that you are gentle towards all men, would it follow that our governors are mere tyrants in taxing the Colonies?

But you add, " In all logical treatiſes there is a topic of ar-" gument called AUTHORITY. Your authority, Sir, with " multitudes of your followers"—" is great. My repreſen-" tation to the public, of your amazing political verſatility," (verſatility! I am told that this is a favourite term of Dr. Prieſtley: ſurely, Sir, you have not been ploughing with his heifer!) " was calculated to weaken that authority." So, Sir, the truth comes out at laſt.—The caſe is this: at the beginning

beginning of the controverſy between England and America, Mr. Weſley thought the Americans were in the right; but having read Dr. Johnſon's tract, he was convinced of his miſtake, and without delay acknowledged it. This Mr. Evans calls, AMAZING VERSATILITY! as if the like (which is happening every day) had never happened before! And this AMAZING VERSATILITY he dreſſes up into a ſcarecrow; that by AMAZING the public, he may weaken Mr. Weſley's authority. In other words, Mr. Evans labours and ſweats hard, in ſtraining and torturing an AMAZING circumſtance, which, by the bye, has no connexion with the cauſe in hand, that he may divert the readers from Mr. Weſley's arguments, which *do* relate to it, by prejudicing them againſt his perſon. And ſo AMAZING is Mr. Evans's modeſty, that he tells the public this was his deſign!

In anſwer to Mr. Weſley's declaration, that he had totally forgot he ever ſaw the tract you mentioned, you ſay, "It is "not only *poſſible*, but *probable*, that in a few months you "may totally forget that you ever read a tract, intitled, "Taxation no Tyranny." You certainly mean, Mr. Weſley had not forgot that he ſaw the tract in queſtion; and that, therefore, he is a WICKED LIAR, let him ſay what he will to the contrary. Now, reader, is this the *ſpirit* of MODERATION, or of BIGOTRY? Is this the *voice* of CANDOUR or of INSULT? Is this the *behaviour* of a GENTLEMAN or of a ——— ? Oh! Mr. Evans! how ſoon have you forgot your own maxim, that, "To triumph over the vanquiſhed is "ungenerous?"

Once more; "If you perfectly knew I was the author of "Americanus," you ſay, "where was your *candour* and *in-* "*tegrity*, in making the public believe Americanus's letter "was wrote by two Anabaptiſt Miniſters, aſſiſted by a gen- "tleman and a tradeſman of the Church of England?" I anſwer: Mr. Weſley knew that you was the perſon who called himſelf Americanus; that you was the principal perſon employed in this affair, and (if his informer did not deceive him) that the other three were your auxiliaries. Here then is no breach either of *candour* or *integrity*.

FINIS.